Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 28 2000
CLERK

(2)

No. 00-113

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Joan Godwin PIERSON,
Petitioner Pro Se,

v.

California Court of Appeal
Second District;
Los Angeles County Superior Court West;
and Wilshire Terrace Corporation
Respondents.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The California Court of Appeal
and to Los Angeles County Superior Court West
and to Wilshire Terrace Corporation

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF FOR PETITION #00-113 FOR INTERVENING MATTER UNDER USSC RULE #15.8

Joan Godwin Pierson
2250 Clarendon Boulevard
#1811
Arlington, VA 22201
703-841-4730

Petitioner Pro Se

SPP

For seven years Petitioner has asked courts to rule on her claims. No court listened. Papers and docket entries disappear or are altered. Slander prevents help. A State Trial Court Judge, who had never been exposed to the litigation, without reason, law, or jurisdiction gave Petitioner's assets to respondent. Higher courts refused to stay judgment. Interest increases daily and liens on Petitioner's property have been recorded without lawful adjudication.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether individuals' right to free speech, as right to be heard in a court of law, is as fundamental as is the right of press, commerce, etc. to be heard in public forum under U.S. Constitution Amendments I and XIV, 28 U.S.C. ##1443, 1343; and 42 U.S.C. #1983.

2. Whether denial of right to be heard in court, where all court rulings are based on only one party's claims, violates U.S. Constitution III, Amends. I, V, VIII, XIV; and Civil Rights Titles 28 #1343, #1443; and 42 #1981, #1982, #1983, #1985, #1986 and #1988.

3. Whether defendants' right not to sign a contract, where State Courts interfere with said right by ruling on basis of plaintiff's claims only, ignoring defendant's claims of no case or controversy, insufficient ground, and granting plaintiff substantial monetary awards based solely on unilateral unsigned contract, is violated under U.S. Constitution Art.I sec.10, Art III; Amends. V and XIV.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF FOR PETITION #00-113

INTERVENING MATTER UNDER USSC RULE #15.8.

RESPONDENT FILED NOTICE OF FOREIGN JURISDICTION WHERE PETITIONER CLAIMS THERE IS NONE IN ORIGINAL COURT

On August 19, 2000 Petitioner Joan Godwin Pierson ["Pierson"] received notice of foreign judgment #119880 180/2167 [App.1] dated August 14, 2000 filed in Arlington County Circuit Court, in the State of Virginia, by Stuart Raphael of Hunton & Williams lawfirm for Wilshire Terrace Corporation ["WTC Co-op"].

On August 23, 2000 Pierson filed an objection to foreign jurisdiction [App.2] where no original jurisdiction exists [App.2].

This creates questionable actions on the same matters in courts of two different States [fn.1] while petition 00-113 is pending in this High Court. All three are the same litigation [same parties, issues, remedy etc.] on multiple grounds supporting lack of jurisdiction in all courts since the year 1993.

Pierson's assets and property are scheduled for confiscation on or before September 04, 2000. The seven year pattern of all courts' decisions [both State and Federal] is based on only one party's claims and authorities: relentlessly, consistantly, and unwaveringly.

---

fn.1 California State appeal #B139022 on actions SC023196 [paid in full] and SC027184 void-ab-initio] discussed in detail in Pierson's petition and now also in Virginia] State simultaneously with Pierson's petition for writ of certiorari pending in this High Court.

Virginia Civil Procedure ["Va.Civ.Proc.," fn.2] states at 618 that:

"lack of jurisdiction of the court rendering the foreign judgment may always be asserted as a defense." and "It would indeed be an anomaly if full faith and credit had to be given to a void judgment," citing Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Whaley [fn.3] and quoting Aetna [at ___]: ".. if full faith and credit is given to the judgment and it is void at the place of rendition, it must be void in the place where it is sought to be enforced." and "judgment unenforeeable in a foreign state is not recoverable in Virginia .." [at ___].

The systemic goals of our jurisprudence are reflected in public policies of fairness, justice and judicial economy [Va.Civ.Proc. 1999 supp. at 48].

Virginia courts' ruling to confiscate Pierson's assets, as well as California courts' orders, would extend immesurably six months' litigation already frivolously extended to vexacious litigation of over seven years to many more years, yet no merits have ever been noticed. This Court, now the only refuge for relief, must decide based on dispositive facts and controlling laws if fairness, jstice and judicial economy is to be respected.

This Highest Court must give notice by handing down a definitive law to all State and Federal courts at every level to prohibit discretion used politically in listening to and ruling on only one of two parties and used prejudicially silencing one party while providing the other with all it wants.

---

fn.2. 3d ed.by Kent Sinclair and Leigh Middleditch, Jr. Pub 1998 Lexis Law Publishing.
fn.3. 173 Va. 11, 3 S.E.2d 395 (1939)

The new matter and added State [Virginia] herein noticed did not appear to exist at the time of Pierson's filing petition #00-113. Plenary consideration of this Court would fortify the arguments presented in said petition. This Court's consideration of the magnitude of the courts themselves violating in massive proportions procedural rules and substantive legal protections would advance the interests of all courts as well as those having decided petitioner's fate. Orderly litigation of all State and Federal courts regarding the obstruction of justice is vital where all courts' rulings have been based on the interests presented by one party only.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, The Petition for writ of certiorari should be granted with all errors brought to light to ascertain whether Pierson, with all American citizens, has the right to freedom from litigation which should have ended seven years ago, freedom from awards to the wrong party, and damages and compensation for losses.

DATED: August 27, 2000

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Joan Godwin Pierson,
Petitioner Pro Se